DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 225 CE 067 121

AUTHOR	Crawford, Clarence C.
TITLE	Multiple Employment Training Programs. How Legislative Proposals Address Concerns. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Housing and Aviation, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives. Statement of Clarence C. Crawford, Associate Director, Education and Employment Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division.
INSTITUTION	General Accounting Office, Washington, DC. Health, Education, and Human Services Div.
REPORT NO	GAO/T-HEHS-94-221
PUB DATE	4 Aug 94
NOTE	45p.; For related documents, see ED 367 826, ED 367 840, ED 367 898, ED 369 963-964, and ED 372 270.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. General Accounting Office, P.O. Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015 (first copy free; additional copies $2 each; 100 or more: 25% discount).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Administrator Responsibility; Administrators; Adult Education; Education Work Relationship; *Employment Programs; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Needs Assessment; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; School Business Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Proposed Legislation

ABSTRACT

In the fragmented federal system, over 150 programs provide employment training assistance to adults and out-of-school youth. Individually, these programs have well-intended purposes. Collectively, they raise four concerns: (1) they are difficult for job seekers and employers to access and for administrators to implement; (2) they overlap and duplicate one another, adding unnecessary administrative costs to program operation; (3) they fail to meet client needs; and (4) many lack the basic monitoring and evaluation systems needed to determine whether they are achieving desired results. During the past year, members of Congress have introduced 13 legislative proposals that would restructure parts of the federal employment training system. The bills contain provisions that would reduce the number of programs, create clearer points of entry and clearer pathways between programs, or create more common definitions and requirements. Proposals that would simplify the system could also improve the system's administrative efficiency. Although some proposals include provisions concerning mix of services, only a few specifically call for an independent comprehensive assessment or better local labor market information and linkages with employers to ensure that training would prepare clients for meaningful jobs. Most proposals recognize the need to hold program administrators accountable for program performance. (Appendixes include tables comparing the proposals with regard to each of the four concerns.) (YLB)

CE

United States General Accounting Office

GAO

Testimony

Before the Subcommittee on Employment, Housing, and Aviation
Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 10:00 a.m., EST
Thursday, August 4, 1994

MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

How Legislative Proposals Address Concerns

Statement of Clarence C. Crawford, Associate Director, Education and Employment Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division

ED 374 225

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE067121

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

We are pleased to be here today to discuss the need to restructure the "fragmented" federal system for providing employment training assistance and how legislative proposals introduced by members of the Congress address the concerns identified through our prior work. Faced with stiff global competition, corporate downsizing, and budget constraints, the federal government can no longer afford to invest billions of dollars in a system that wastes resources and does not ensure that people receive the help they need to make the successful transition into productive employment.

By our count, over 150 programs provide employment training assistance to adults and out-of-school youth. When reviewed individually, these programs have well-intended purposes. However, collectively they raise several concerns. First, they are difficult for jobseekers and employers to access and for administrators to implement. Second, they overlap and duplicate one another, adding unnecessary administrative costs to program operation. Third, they fail to meet client needs. And, fourth, many programs lack the basic monitoring and evaluation systems needed to determine whether programs are achieving desired results.

While many agree that changes are needed, how to create a more efficient and effective system has sparked much discussion. During the past year, 13 legislative proposals were introduced by members of the Congress that would restructure some parts of the federal employment training system.

Our analysis of the 13 proposals showed that many of the proposals address several of the concerns with the current employment training system. (See appendix) We believe these proposals represent a strong step in the development of a customer-oriented system that will address all the concerns identified from our prior work.

BACKGROUND

The proposed budget for fiscal year 1994 included about $25 billion for 154 programs and funding streams to (1) assist the unemployed, (2) enhance skills or employability of workers, and (3) create employment opportunities. These services are provided through 14 federal departments and independent agencies. Each department provides staff and incurs costs to plan and monitor these programs. In addition, each program has its own set of policies, procedures, and requirements. Generally, these programs use the similar service delivery approaches and funding mechanisms; that is, most provide grants to state and local agencies to identify clients, provide basic or vocational training, and link clients with employers.

Our prior work has shown that this patchwork of employment training programs confuses workers, employers, and administrators because it has no clear entry points and no clear path from one program to another, and the numerous programs have complex and different eligibility requirements while often targeting the same groups.[1] Even when people find their way to a local agency, they often face a burdensome intake process with lengthy application forms to determine whether they are eligible for services. Employers also experience problems with the fragmented system of employment training programs. Employers want a system that is easy to access and provides qualified job candidates. Instead, employers must cope with over 50 programs that provide job referrals and placement assistance.

Despite decades of attempts to better coordinate employment training programs, program administrators continue to face conflicting program requirements that hamper efforts to coordinate activities and share resources to ensure that participants get needed services.[2] For example, the 16 programs that target youth use 4 different program operating cycles. A 1991 survey of state and local program administrators identified more than 80 commonly used terms and definitions that administrators believe need to be

---

[1]For a listing of GAO reports and testimony concerning multiple employment training programs, see Related GAO Products.

[2]Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Hamper Delivery of Services (GAO/HEHS-94-78, Jan. 28, 1994).

standardized including terms such as personal income, job placement, allowable support services.[3]

We cannot determine how much is spent to administer the current array of federal employment training programs because cost information is not readily available for many programs.[4] Based on past work and the work of other researchers, we reported that estimates of administrative costs range from as low as 7 percent to as high as 15 or 20 percent. Given the large number of federal Departments and agencies involved in the administration of these programs, we believe the administrative savings from streamlining the number of federal programs could be substantial. Eliminating the need for separate staffs to administer, monitor, and evaluate programs at the state and local levels could also save resources.

We also found that programs frequently do not meet the needs of jobseekers. Some programs provide only a limited set of services that may not meet the needs of their clients. In addition, because local service providers, who are under contract with local employment training programs, often do their own outreach and have a financial stake in directing clients to their programs, little attempt is generally made to refer clients to other programs with more appropriate services. Another reason program participants may not receive assistance that meets their needs is that some service providers do not have strong links with employers or labor market information. Labor market information can help program administrators make decisions about the types of training that would be most appropriate to prepare their participants for the local job market.

Another concern with the fragmented system is the lack of effort to monitor the outcomes or measure the impact of programs providing employment training assistance. We found that less than half the programs collect data on participant outcomes to determine whether participants found a job upon completing the program.[5] Without this information, service providers do not get meaningful

---

[3]Streamlining and Integrating Human Resource Development Service for Adults, National Governors' Association (Washington, D.C., 1991).

[4]Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs (GAO/HEHS-94-80, Jan.28, 1994).

[5]Multiple Employment Training Programs: Most Federal Agencies Do Not Know If Their Programs Are Working Effectively (GAO/HEHS-94-88, Mar. 2, 1994).

feedback as to whether their graduates exit the program with the skills employers need.

We also found that few agencies had performed or sponsored evaluations that compared the outcomes of participants with the outcomes of similar nonparticipants so that they could determine if the employment training assistance provided really made a difference or whether participants would most likely have achieved the same outcomes without the program. Our review of 62 programs showed that only 7 had conducted such studies. For those seven programs, the study results have been mixed, at best.

Concerns about these problems in the current system have led the administration and others to suggest the need for overhauling programs that provide employment training to the same target populations. For example, the 1993 National Performance Review (NPR) concluded that the current system of employment training programs is inefficient and ineffective, and it recommended several changes, including the consolidation of programs serving dislocated workers.

The National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP) and the Welfare Simplification and Coordination Advisory Committee also have recommended a major overhaul of the many federal employment training programs that serve the economically disadvantaged. They expressed concern that the existing program structures acted as barriers to clients trying to gain access to services. The Welfare Simplification Committee concluded that "Eliminating duplicative bureaucracies will reduce administrative costs, saving money that can be used, instead, for client services."

NEED TO SIMPLIFY THE SYSTEM

Regardless of the mechanisms used, there appears to be a consensus across the 13 legislative proposals that the employment training system needs to be simpler to access and administer. These proposals contain provisions that would, in effect, either reduce the number of programs, create clearer points of entry and clearer pathways between programs, or create more common definitions and requirements.

Several proposals identify, or propose a commission or council to identify, specific programs to be eliminated or consolidated. For example, the "CAREERS Act" introduced by Congressman Goodling would eliminate some programs while consolidating others in establishing several block grants that target specific populations such as disadvantaged adults, dislocated workers, and veterans.

Similarly, the "Job Training Consolidation Act" introduced by Senator Kassebaum would eliminate or consolidate employment training programs. The act proposed by Senator Kassebaum would establish a commission that, in consultation with federal, state, and local officials, would examine strategies and provide recommendations for restructuring the system within 26 months of being enacted.

By reducing the number of programs that appear to serve the same target population, such as the economically disadvantaged, or provide the same function, such as adult literacy training, the employment training system would be more streamlined and easier for clients to understand and access and less complicated for administrators to implement. However, to have the maximum impact without reducing the availability of services, care must be taken to consolidate or eliminate only those programs that share similar characteristics such as goals, client groups, services, and delivery mechanisms.[6]

Another approach to simplifying the employment training system is creating one-stop centers at the service delivery level to create clearer points of entry and clearer pathways between programs. For example, the administration's proposed "Reemployment Act" would require that local areas establish one or more career centers as the access point for coordinating enhanced services for dislocated workers.[7] This act would also provide states with seed money to expand career centers for all segments of the population and offer a comprehensive menu of employment, education, and training services. The "Independence for Families Act" introduced by Congressman McCurdy would use the one-stop center approach to bring together programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, and School-to-Work Opportunities Act, among others.

By consolidating duplicative intake and assessment processes, these centers would eliminate the duplication of service delivery structures. In addition, they could provide a focal point for labor market information and contacts with employers instead of having several agencies trying to compile information on local job openings.

---

[6]Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency (GAO/HEHS-94-193, July 11, 1994).

[7]We include in our discussion of the proposed "Reemployment Act" four substantially identical bills pending before the Congress: S. 1951, S. 1964, H.R. 4040, and H.R. 4050.

Because of the complex nature of the current system, several proposals also would establish or further encourage the use of case managers to assist clients in navigating through the maize of programs to access the services that are needed to transition into productive employment. For example, the "Working Off Welfare Act" introduced by Congresswoman Woolsey encourages the use of case managers that make referrals and coordinate services for AFDC recipients. The job of the case managers would be made easier if the programs share common definitions of eligibility and other terms.

Many of the proposals would also establish procedures for eliminating conflicting requirements and administrative procedures by granting local program administrators waivers from the federal statute. For example, the "Local Flexibility Act" introduced by Congressman Conyers would establish an Interagency Review Council to approve local agency requests for waivers from federal requirements. These waivers provide flexibility for local administrators to create common definitions so that programs serving the same target populations can be merged or, at least, other clients in the general target population can more readily access services from other programs.

NEED FOR GREATER ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

Proposals that would simplify the system also could improve the system's administrative efficiency. For example, efforts to simplify the system by reducing the number of programs also reduce the administrative bureaucracies associated with those programs. The reduction in the number of programs at the federal level can also result in similar reductions at the state or local level.

However, not all efforts to simplify the employment training system result in improved administrative efficiencies. For example, granting waivers to allow administrators to develop common definitions can help reduce some of the confusion and establishing one-stop centers can make the system easier for clients to understand and administrators to implement. But because these approaches leave the administrative bureaucracy at the federal level still in place, they do not resolve the basic problem with multiple programs and the administrative overlap and duplication that results.

NEED TO BETTER TAILOR SERVICES TO CLIENT NEEDS

To maximize the benefit of the services provided to clients these services need to be tailored to the individual client's

needs. They should take into account the client's prior training, work experience, and aptitudes as well as the local economy and potential job opportunities, and offer a broad enough mix of services to accommodate most client needs.

While some proposals include provisions concerning the mix of services, only a few specifically call for an independent comprehensive assessment or better local labor market information and linkages with employers needed to ensure that the training being provided will prepare clients for meaningful jobs. For example, the administration's "Reemployment Act" would promote the development of a customer-centered approach to help ensure that services are tailored to participants' needs at the local level. Regardless of what other changes are made in the structure of the employment training system, ensuring that clients receive an independent assessment and the right mix of services is critical to the success of any employment training program.

NEED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Most of the proposals recognize the need to hold program administrators accountable for program performance. Several proposals would require agencies to establish performance standards and develop systems to gather outcome information. For example, the "Job Training Consolidation Act" introduced by Senator Kassebaum would establish a commission to develop appropriate standards to measure the outcomes of federal employment training programs.[8] Clearly defined performance standards are the cornerstone of any strategy to ensure accountability. To measure or compare program performance, there must be clear targets or benchmarks against which the performance of individual programs can be compared. Without such standards, program administrators do not know whether they are meeting expectations.

Several proposals also would establish systems for collecting data on individual participants so that administrators would know which services were received by whom and what outcomes were achieved. For example, the "Reemployment Act" would require states and local areas to maintain standardized records for all participants. In addition, it would require comparable management information systems to provide data needed for monitoring and

---

[8]The Congress recently passed the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which will require agencies to gather program performance data. Specifically , the act requires agencies to (1) have a strategic plan for program activities; (2) establish program performance goals that are objective, quantifiable, and measurable; and (3) submit a report on program performance to the President and the Congress.

evaluation. This information is important to administrators attempting to ensure that services are being equitably distributed and that client outcomes are related to program services.

Equally important evaluation information is determining program impact. That is, determining whether programs really make a difference or whether participants would likely have achieved the same outcomes without the program. Both the "Reemployment Act" and the "CAREERS Act" would require evaluations of program impact on participants and the local community.

CONCLUSIONS

We have identified many elements that we believe need to be addressed if the current employment training system is to be transformed into an efficient and effective customer-oriented system, namely:

-- simplifying the system by reducing the number of programs, creating clearer points of entry and clearer pathways between programs, and eliminating conflicting requirements and administrative procedures;

-- encouraging administrative efficiency by eliminating overlapping administrative bureaucracies as well as duplicative service delivery structures;

-- tailoring services to meet client needs by requiring independent assessments of clients, broadening the mix of services, and improving linkages with employers; and

-- ensuring accountability by clearly defining goals and performance standards, creating data collection systems that measure performance, and requiring impact evaluations of major programs.

Many of the legislative proposals introduced in the Congress contain several of these elements. While restructuring the employment training system will not be easy, these proposals represent a strong step toward developing the customer-oriented system we believe is needed.

- - - -

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement. I would like to thank you and the Ranking Minority Member for your efforts to address these issues. At this time, I will be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Table I.1: Thirteen Legislative Proposals Included In Analysis

Proposal number	Proposal name	Introduced by	Date introduced
H.R. 2943	National Workforce Preparation and Development Reform Act	Congressman Goodling	Aug. 6, 1993
H.R. 4407[a]	Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment and Retraining Systems Act	Congressman Goodling	May 12, 1994
S. 1943	Job Training Consolidation Act of 1994	Senator Kassebaum	Mar. 17, 1994
H.R. 4040[b]	Reemployment Act of 1994	Congressman Rostenkowski	Mar. 16, 1994
S. 1951[b]	Reemployment Act of 1994	Senator Moynihan	Mar. 17, 1994
H.R. 4050[c]	Reemployment Act of 1994	Congressman Ford	Mar. 16, 1994
S. 1964[c]	Reemployment and Retraining Act of 1994	Senator Metzenbaum	Mar. 24, 1994
H.R. 3736	Workforce Education Act of 1994	Congressman Andrews	Jan. 26, 1994
H.R. 2825	Training for Future Jobs Act of 1993	Congressman Conyers	Aug. 2, 1993
H.R. 2856	Local Flexibility Act of 1994	Congressman Conyers	Aug. 4, 1993
H.R. 3742	Welfare Elimination Act of 1994	Congressman Fingerhut	Jan. 26, 1994
H.R. 4414	Independence for Families Act of 1994	Congressman McCurdy	May 12, 1994
H.R. 4318	Working Off Welfare Act of 1994	Congresswoman Woolsey	Apr. 28, 1994

[a]H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943 but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

APPENDIX

[b]H.R. 4040 and S. 1951 are companion bills.

[c]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

Table I.2: Comparison of Legislative Proposals That Would Restructure the Federal Employment Training System

Elements	Legislative proposals								
	H.R. 4407[a]	S. 1943	H.R.4040/ S.1951[b]	H.R. 3736	H.R. 2825	H.R. 2856	H.R. 3742	H.R. 4414	H.R. 4318
To simplify the system									
Reduce number of programs	X	X	X	X			X		
Create clearer points of entry and paths between programs	X	X	X	X				X	X
Eliminate conflicting requirements/procedures	X	X	X		X	X			
To improve administrative efficiency									
Eliminate overlapping administrative bureaucracies	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Eliminate duplicative service delivery structures	X	X	X	X				X	X
To better tailor services to client needs									
Expand mix of services	X	X	X			X		X	
Develop independent assessment process			X					X	X
Develop stronger linkages with labor market/employers	X	X	X						X
To improve accountability									
Establish clear goals and performance measurements	X	X	X		X	X		X	X
Conduct impact evaluations	X		X						

[a]H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943, it but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

[b]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

Table I.3: Comparison of Proposed Legislative Provisions to Simplify the Employment Training System

Legislative proposal	Reduce number of programs	Create clearer points of entry and paths between programs	Eliminate conflicting requirements and administrative procedures
Goodling (H.R. 4407)[1]	Establishes several block grants to consolidate programs that target specific populations, including disadvantaged adults, dislocated workers, veterans, youth, migrant and seasonal farm workers and Native Americans. (Sec. 341-394) Establishes three block grants to consolidate programs that provide specific services: adult literacy, vocational and technical education, and vocational rehabilitation. (Sec. 301-321) Establishes the Federal Workforce Preparation and Development Council and requires the Council to make specific recommendations for the elimination of fragmentation and duplication among programs and the consolidation of similar programs. (Sec. 101, 104)	States and local areas may establish a network of community job resource centers that provide "one-stop shopping", or common points of entry, for individuals. (Sec. 234, 241) Community job resource centers shall have information for public use on program eligibility requirements and the availability and effectiveness of program services. (Sec. 234) States may establish literacy resource centers to enhance coordination of literacy services. (Sec. 305) Amends the Job Training Partnership Act to allow states to use funds to develop comprehensive and fully integrated workforce development programs. (Sec. 401)	The Federal Workforce Preparation and Development Council shall recommend changes in program rules and regulations to ensure consistent interpretation, guidance and coordination. (Sec. 104) The National Commission for Employment Policy shall recommend how to develop common terms, definitions, reporting requirements and core data elements to create cross-program intake, eligibility and assessment procedures. (Sec. 113) The Council may waive provisions of laws or regulations for states volunteering to participate in reform efforts, if these provisions prevent the application of consistent practices and procedures related to the use of common definitions, performance standards, common participant and program data, common cost categories and limitations. Within limitations, the Council may also waive eligibility requirements to increase flexibility in developing common definitions for eligible individuals. Waivers cannot alter the program purpose, goals, or allocation of funds. (Sec. 121)

Kassebaum (S. 1943)	Establish a federal-level Commission on Employment and Training to examine strategies for consolidating or eliminating federal employment training programs, in consultation with federal, state and local officials. The Commission shall report on recommendations for proposed reforms no later than 26 months after enactment. (Sec. 212) The Act would repeal numerous federal programs, effective 29 months after enactment, to create a single, comprehensive employment training system. (Sec. 212)	State and local entities may develop an integrated system that assures that individuals seeking employment will receive information about all available employment training services regardless of where the individuals initially enter the system. (Sec. 101-104)	State and local entities may use funds from numerous programs, without regard to the requirements of any covered Act, to develop a comprehensive statewide employment training system. (Sec. 101-104) The Commission shall determine appropriate standards that specify a common terminology for programs and services to facilitate access to such services among states and localities. (Sec. 212)

19

20

APPENDIX

Rostenkowski and Moynihan (H.R. 4040 and S. 1951)[2]	Consolidate dislocated worker programs (programs under Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, among others) into a comprehensive program for worker reemployment. (Sec. 101, Sec. 192)	Under the comprehensive program for worker reemployment, local grantees must establish one or more career centers to provide a wide range of services to dislocated workers. (Sec. 118, 119) Local areas may also establish one-stop career centers that provide customer choice in obtaining services to all segments of the population. (Sec. 313) The Secretary of Labor shall develop a national logo and name for all one-stop career centers as part of a nationwide system to enable individuals to readily identify and access one-stop centers in any state in any location. (Sec. 353) For local areas that establish one-stop career centers, the dislocated worker program would be part of the one-stop center, rather than a separate career center. Provisions mandate that several other programs must provide services through the one-stop centers, including programs under the Wagner-Peyser Act and Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act, among others. Many other programs may voluntarily work through the one-stop centers, including the JOBS program, the Food Stamp Employment and Training program, and Vocational Education programs. (Sec. 315) Education	The one-stop career system establishes a national program of grants and waivers of federal statutory and regulatory requirements, through the Secretary of Labor, to provide the states an opportunity, on a voluntary basis, to develop and implement a network of one-stop career centers. (Sec. 301,333)

APPENDIX

Andrews (H.R. 3736)	The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a study on the feasibility of consolidating the administration of Federal dislocated worker programs (specifically programs under Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Trade Adjustment Assistance program under the Trade Act of 1974) into a single comprehensive program. (Sec. 301)	The study shall consider the feasibility of a consolidated program whose goals include common points of access at the local level; a process for determining eligibility of dislocated workers for training and related services; and increased flexibility in how dislocated workers receive and use such training and related services. (Sec. 301)	No specific provision..
Conyers (H.R. 2825)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	This five-year demonstration program would establish a federal-level Job Training Council which could waive, for nonprofit organizations, requirements of different existing Federal job training assistance programs for adults and out-of-school youth that are inconsistent, if such a waiver is likely to make the organization's job training programs more efficient and the organization's job training plan is part of an economic development plan adopted by local government. (Sec. 6)
Conyers (H.R. 2856)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	Establish a federal-level Interagency Review Council which could approve waivers of any Federal statutory or regulatory requirements, including those related to education and employment training programs, that would be reasonably necessary to implement an integrated assistance plan in a local area. (Sec. 4,6,9,10)

Fingerhut (H.R. 3742)	Establish a federal-level Commission to Eliminate Welfare which would design a replacement for numerous federal programs that target the economically disadvantaged, including programs under the Job Training Partnership Act. The Commission shall recommend legislation to enact such programs, modifications, and tax credits within six months after a majority of members have been appointed. (Sec. 3, 4, and 8)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
McCurdy (H.R. 4414)	No specific provision.	States may develop a program, which would replace the JOBS, that utilizes and makes available to AFDC recipients, through the establishment and operation or utilization of federal or state one-stop employment shops, services of numerous federal programs, including programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, among others. (Sec. 301)	No specific provision.

Woolsey (H.R. 4318)	No specific provision.	The state agency shall establish at least one convenient location in each community at which a person may apply for and receive, directly or through referral to the appropriate provider, assistance from the AFDC program, as well as employment training and support services. (Sec. 109) The state agency shall assign each AFDC recipient a case manager who is knowledgeable about community resources and qualified to make referrals to appropriate education and training programs. (Sec. 109) Case workers may be outstationed at community colleges to enhance access of AFDC recipients to higher education and provide linkages between postsecondary educational institutions and private and public sectors, including private industry councils. (Sec. 121) States may fund activities that provide AFDC recipients, and their children in secondary school, with information about the availability of services in other federal programs, including programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. (Sec. 121)	No specific provision.

[1]Congressman Goodling introduced H.R. 2943 and H.R. 4407, on August 6, 1993 and May 12, 1994, respectively. H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943, but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

[2]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

Table I.4: Comparison of Proposed Legislative Provisions to Improve Administrative Efficiency in the Employment Training System

Legislative proposal	Eliminate overlapping administrative bureaucracies	Eliminate duplicative service delivery structures
Goodling (H.R. 4407)[1]	States may apply for waivers of laws and regulations to improve the efficiency of programs. (Sec. 212) The Federal Workforce Preparation and Development Council shall make recommendations for the consolidation of Federal administration of workforce preparation and development programs. (Sec. 104)	States and local areas may establish a network of community job resource centers to encourage greater coordination and minimize duplication of services among programs. (Sec. 241)
Kassebaum (S. 1943)	Establishes a federal-level Commission on Employment and Training to examine strategies for consolidating or eliminating federal employment training programs. The Commission shall report on recommendations for proposed reforms no later than 26 months after enactment. (Sec. 212) The Act would repeal numerous federal programs, effective 29 months after enactment, to create a single, comprehensive employment training system. (Sec. 212)	To reduce overlap and duplicative activities, state and local entities may combine the covered activities and fund the combined activities, or eliminate one of the covered activities and increase the funding to the remaining covered activity. (Sec. 101-104)
Rostenkowski and Moynihan (H.R. 4040 and S. 1951)[2]	One-stop career centers may be administered by a consortium which identifies procedures that would be used to promote the integration of the administration of the programs. (Sec. 313)	Under the comprehensive program for worker reemployment, local grantees must establish one or more career centers to provide a wide range of services to dislocated workers. (Sec. 118,119) Local areas may establish one-stop career centers that include services for the comprehensive program for worker reemployment and many other federal programs. (Sec. 315) A national labor market information system would fulfill the labor market information requirements of numerous federal programs. (Sec. 401)
Andrews (H.R. 3736)	The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a study on the feasibility of a consolidated program (specifically programs under Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Trade Adjustment Assistance program under the Trade Act) one goal of which is to reduce overlap in administration of such programs. (Sec. 301)	The study will consider the feasibility of a consolidated program, one goal of which is the establishment of common points of access at the local level. (Sec. 301)
Conyers (H.R. 2825)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.

Legislative proposal	Eliminate overlapping administrative bureaucracies	Eliminate duplicative service delivery structures
Conyers (H.R. 2856)	Local areas may develop an integrated assistance plan that shall improve the efficiency and effectiveness of providing benefits under federal programs by reducing administrative rigidity, duplication, and unnecessary expenditures. (Sec. 5)	No specific provision.
Fingerhut (H.R. 3742)	Establish a federal-level Commission to Eliminate Welfare which would design a replacement for numerous federal programs that target the economically disadvantaged, including programs under the Job Training Partnership Act. The Commission shall recommend legislation to enact such programs, modifications, and tax credits within six months after a majority of members have been appointed. (Sec. 3, 4, and 8)	No specific provision.
McCurdy (H.R. 4414)	No specific provision.	States may develop a program for AFDC recipients that establishes and operates one-stop employment shops, or utilizes appropriate federal or state one-stop shops, to make available the employment training services of numerous federal programs. (Sec. 301)
Woolsey (H.R. 4318)	No specific provision.	The state agency shall establish at least one convenient location in each community (if practicable, as defined by the Secretary in regulations) at which a person may apply for and receive, directly or through referral to the appropriate provider, aid under the state plan, as well as employment training and support services. (Sec. 109)

[1]Congressman Goodling introduced H.R. 2943 and H.R. 4407, on August 6, 1993 and May 12, 1994, respectively. H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943, but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

[2]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

Table I.5: Comparison of Proposed Legislative Provisions to Better Tailor Services to Client Needs in the Employment Training System

Legislative proposal	Expand mix of services	Develop independent assessment process	Develop stronger linkages with labor market information and employers
Goodling (H.R. 4407)[1]	The National Commission for Employment Policy shall recommend how to expand services to eligible individuals. (Sec. 113)	No specific provision.	States and local areas may establish community job resource centers that shall better inform individuals regarding employment opportunities and local labor market conditions. (Sec. 241) The National Commission for Employment Policy shall recommend how to ensure that programs are responsive to the needs of American businesses. (Sec. 113) States may establish Local Workforce Development Boards that shall promote the adoption of industry-recognized skill standards by local business, industry, and education and training providers. (Sec. 234)
Kassebaum (S. 1943)	State and local entities may develop a comprehensive statewide employment training system that addresses the high priority needs of unemployed persons in the state or community. (Sec. 101-104)	No specific provision.	State and local entities may use program funds to develop a comprehensive statewide employment training system that must include employer involvement in planning, development and implementation of the system. (Sec. 101-104) The Commission on Employment and Training shall conduct a study that examines strategies for implementing a national on-line labor market information system. In addition, the study shall develop a single, coherent national policy that requires employer involvement in planning, development and implementation of the system. (Sec. 212)

APPENDIX

Legislative proposal	Expand mix of services	Develop independent assessment process	Develop stronger linkages with labor market information and employers
Rostenkowski and Moynihan (H.R. 4040 and S. 1951)[2]	The Secretary shall work with each state to promote the development of a customer service compact among parties administering the one-stop career center systems. This compact would include the respective roles and responsibilities of each party in enhancing the provision of services tailored to the needs of participants in a local area. (Sec. 351) .	States must establish career centers for dislocated worker that administer the process of referring participants to education and training services in a fair and equitable manner and would enforce this through an annual review of the "honest broker functions". (Sec. 118) States may establish one-stop career centers that provide comprehensive and specialized assessments of the skill levels and service needs of individuals. These centers would also provide case management for individuals that would include periodically reviewing the individual's progress toward achieving employment goals. (Sec. 314)	The Secretary of Labor, in coordination with other federal, state and local entities, shall develop a strategy to establish a nationwide network of local labor market information that is locally-based, accurate, up-to-date, easily accessible, and user-friendly. (Sec. 402)
Andrews (H.R. 3736)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
Conyers (H.R. 2825)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
Conyers (H.R. 2856)	Local areas may develop an integrated assistance plan that shall include elements that will help individuals decide on the scope of services necessary and desired to meet the full range of their needs. (Sec. 4) The integrated assistance plan cannot reduce the level of benefits for any individual or family. (Sec. 5)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
Fingerhut (H.R. 3742)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.	No specific provision.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Legislative proposal	Expand mix of services	Develop independent assessment process	Develop stronger linkages with labor market information and employers
McCurdy (H.R. 4414)	States may develop a program for AFDC recipients that provides participants case management services to ensure the integrated provision of benefits and services. (Sec. 301) A case manager shall present each participant with each option offered under the program through which the participant will, over time, be moved into full-time unsubsidized employment. (Sec. 301)	States may develop a program that assigns a case management team to each program participant to develop a participation agreement that includes an individualized comprehensive plan to move the participant into full-time unsubsidized employment. (Sec. 301)	No specific provision.
Woolsey (H.R. 4318)	No specific provision.	The state agency shall assign each AFDC recipient a case manager who is knowledgeable about community resources, qualified to make referrals to appropriate education and training programs and coordinate the provision of benefits. (Sec. 109) State plans must describe the policies and procedures to ensure AFDC recipients who need educational activities are placed in programs with clear goals, benchmark, and timetables for measuring progress, and periodic reassessments to determine the continued appropriateness of their participation in such activities. (Sec. 115)	States shall use local labor market information and an assessment of the individual's needs to help participants identify one or more target occupations. (Sec. 115)

[1]Congressman Goodling introduced H.R. 2943 and H.R. 4407, on August 6, 1993 and May 12, 1994, respectively. H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943, but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

[2]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

Table I.6: Comparison of Proposed Legislative Provisions to Improve Accountability in the Employment Training System

Legislative proposal	Establish clear goals and performance measurement systems	Conduct impact evaluations
Goodling (H.R. 4407)[1]	The Federal Workforce Preparation and Development Council and the National Commission on Employment Policy shall recommend how to develop an integrated performance measurement system that includes system-level performance as well as performance outcomes of individual programs. (Sec. 104, 113) States may establish a single, integrated performance measurement system for all programs. (Sec. 212) Local areas may develop a strategy to measure the performance of programs and individual service providers. (Sec. 234) The Secretary of Labor shall develop performance standards for the JOBS program that are consistent with performance standards under the Job Training Partnership Act. (Sec. 368)	No specific provision.
Kassebaum (S. 1943)	State and local entities may establish a comprehensive statewide employment training system that includes standards for determining the effectiveness of programs. (Sec. 104) The Commission on Employment and Training shall conduct a study to determine appropriate standards for the federal government to measure the overall effectiveness of employment training programs. (Sec. 212)	No specific provision.
Rostenkowski and Moynihan (H.R. 4040 and S. 1951)[2]	Under the comprehensive program for worker reemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe performance standards relating separately to the substate grantees and the career centers. (Sec. 152) The Secretary of Labor shall also prescribe performance standards for the one-stop career centers. (Sec. 317)	The Secretary shall provide for continuing evaluation of programs under the comprehensive program for worker reemployment and the one-stop centers, that may include an analysis of the impact of the programs on participants and the community. (Sec. 133)
Andrews (H.R. 3736)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
Conyers (H.R. 2825)	The Comptroller General shall report on the extent to which grants under this Act have served to train people for jobs. (Sec. 9)	No specific provision.
Conyers (H.R. 2856)	Local areas may develop an integrated assistance plan which shall include specific goals and measurable performance criteria. (Sec. 4) Local areas must also periodically evaluate the plan's effect on individuals, the community and administrative costs. (Sec. 6) The Comptroller General shall evaluate the effectiveness of federal programs included in approved integrated assistance plans. (Sec. 11)	No specific provision.

Legislative proposal	Establish clear goals and performance measurement systems	Conduct impact evaluations
Fingerhut (H.R. 3742)	No specific provision.	No specific provision.
McCurdy (H.R. 4414)	States may develop a program that shall include performance standards, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to measure the effectiveness of the programs established by this Act in moving participants into full-time unsubsidized employment. (Sec. 301)	No specific provision.
Woolsey (H.R. 4318)	The Secretaries of Education, Health and Human Services, and Labor, shall jointly develop and publish standards that measure the minimum amount of wages and employment benefits that a participant enrolled in a Federal job training program should receive after termination from such program to ensure long-term economic self-sufficiency. (Sec. 211) These Secretaries shall each conduct a study to review the effectiveness of federal job training programs under their jurisdiction. These studies shall include determining the extent to which programs successfully place male and female participants in unsubsidized employment and the average wages and benefits in such employment. (Sec. 201) The Comptroller General shall also conduct similar studies to review the effectiveness of federal job training programs. (Sec 202)	The Federal Workforce Preparation and Development Council shall issue a report containing an evaluation of the effectiveness of unified single State plans relating to waivers of provisions of law including how individuals eligible for services under such programs are impacted, especially with regard to attainment of academic and occupational competencies and job retention. (Sec. 107)

[1]Congressman Goodling introduced H.R. 2943 and H.R. 4407, on August 6, 1993 and May 12, 1994, respectively. H.R. 4407 includes provisions of H.R. 2943, but added provisions to establish a system of block grants and amend the Job Training Partnership Act.

[2]H.R. 4050 and S. 1964 are companion bills related to H.R. 4040 and S. 1951, but do not include provisions for providing income support to dislocated workers while in training.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELATED GAO PRODUCTS

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency (GAO/HEHS-94-193, July 11, 1994).

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Underscore Need for Change (GAO/T-HEHS-94-120, Mar. 10, 1994).

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Is Needed (GAO/T-HEHS-94-109, Mar. 3, 1994).

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Most Federal Agencies Do Not Know If Their Programs Are Working Effectively (GAO/HEHS-94-88, Mar. 2, 1994).

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs (GAO/HEHS-94-80, Jan. 28, 1994).

Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Hamper Delivery of Services (GAO/HEHS-94-78, Jan. 28, 1994).

Multiple Employment Programs: National Employment Strategy Needed (GAO/T-HRD-93-27, June 18, 1993).

Multiple Employment Programs (GAO/HRD-93-26R, June 15, 1993).

The Job Training Partnership Act: Potential for Program Improvements but National Job Training Strategy Needed (GAO/T-HRD-93-18, Apr. 29, 1993).

Multiple Employment Programs (GAO/HRD-92-39R, July 24, 1992).

(203611)

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are $2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015

or visit:

Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (301) 258-4066.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (301) 258-4097 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

Bulk Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

Address Correction Requested

SHIP TO:
GAIL MATHEWS
1301 PICCARD DR. S-300
ROCKVILLE MD 208504305

Request # 3207776 57 3

08/10/94 / 15:14 m
08/19/94 / 18:44 p

3207776571p1

Item	Document Number
1	T-HEHS-94-221